

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

GENBAND US LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

METASWITCH NETWORKS LTD;
METASWITCH NETWORKS CORP.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 2:14-cv-33-JRG-RSP

ORDER


Before the Court is Metaswitch Networks Ltd. and Metaswitch Networks Corp.’s (“Metaswitch’s”) “Objections to the Report and Recommendation on Motions for Summary Judgment (Dkt. No. 408),” which was filed herein on January 9, 2016 (Dkt. No. 430).

Metaswitch asks this Court to reconsider the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 430) regarding Metaswitch’s motion for summary judgment of no indirect infringement after April 14, 2014 (Dkt. 254) and Metaswitch’s motion for summary judgment of invalidity under 35 U.S.C. § 101 (Dkt. 255). Under Rule 72(b), the Court is to determine *de novo* any part of the Magistrate Judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

Having reviewed *de novo* the record and the Magistrate Judge’s report and recommendation regarding Metaswitch’s motions for summary judgment, the Court hereby **ACCEPTS** and adopts in full the report and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge.

Metaswitch’s Objections to the Report and Recommendation on Motions for Summary Judgment (Dkt. No. 408) are **DENIED**.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 12th day of January, 2016.



RODNEY GILSTRAP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE